

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/791,557	KANIZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason K. Gee	2134	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Non-Final

 (1) Jason K. Gee.

(3) _____.

 (2) Thomas G. Eschweiler (36,981).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 01/10/2008
Time: 2:30 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claim 1

Claims discussed:

Claim 1

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



 KAMBIZ ZAND
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner realized there was a typographical mistake in the Office action, incorrectly referring to a reference in the rejection for claim 1 as Hamilton. However, Hamilton is not an inventor in the reference, and should be changed to Fahrny, which is correctly listed in the introduction of the rejection and also in the notice of references cited. The time period will be restarted. The applicant's representative agreed this will be accepted,.



KAMBIZ ZAND
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER